

OSU-related Task Force

Comprehensive Plan Review and LDC 3.36

A review of Land Development Code (LDC) Chapter 3.36 highlighting items that do not adequately address issues identified during our review of the Comprehensive Plan (CP). This is not an attempt to modify LDC 3.36, rather it is a review of items in that code that may have not worked out as well as intended, for which new CP policies may be desired.

1 General

Plans vs. Districts The current planning document from OSU is known as the Campus Master Plan (CMP). The only other entity in the City with a City-adopted master plan is the hospital. OSU is not producing a new Campus Master Plan, but rather are calling the new document a District Plan. In the definitions section, Article 50, of the CP the closest definitions, by name, that I could find are **Plan** and **Special District**. Plans are adopted by the City whereas Special Districts are units of local government. Will OSU become a Special District that is more independent of the City of Corvallis? District or District Plan should be defined in the CP.

Side note: The CP definition of Planning Period is “The period of time between the present and the year 2020.” Is this a copy/paste error from when the Vision 2020 was adopted?

Transportation Demand Management Transportation Demand Management (or TDM) is a term used frequently but is not defined in the LDC or in the CP. There is a reference in CP 11.15 to a supporting document, *Corvallis Transportation Demand Management Plan*, but no entry in Article 50. This website:

http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/REGION2/pages/corvallis_tdm.aspx might provide a definition. TDM should be defined in the CP so it can be used properly.

Livability The CP definition of Livability is “Those aspects of the community perceived by residents which make Corvallis a ‘nice place to live.’ ”

Although LDC 2.6 – Annexations includes Table 2.6-1 *Community-wide Livability Indicators and Benchmarks for Annexation Proposals* it claims only to be a first attempt at categorizing livability indicators and states it may need rework. Also, this is tucked into a section about annexations and is not in a prominent spot such a basic metric should have, given livability is cited in so many other places in the CP.

Side note: CP 1.1.7 says there will be monitoring and assessment of the livability indicators at least every three years. Is this being done?

Plan vs. Code Alignment The 2004 CMP and LDC 3.36 contain discrepancies. LDC language should cite CMP and CP bases. An adoption process should include a public hearing where possible discrepancies can be identified and rectified. An annual review with possibility of text amendments should be held. These requirements can be stipulated in CP policy.

3.36.20 – Definitions Specific to This Chapter

LDC 3.36.20 describes the term Development Area and causes it to supersede the Development Site concept applicable everywhere else in the City. This allows for situations such as placing parking farther away from traffic generators than would otherwise be allowed, which violates the purpose of CP 11.4.3, *All traffic generators shall provide adequate parking*. This policy could be changed to specify a maximum distance between traffic generators and their associated parking.

3.36.30 – Permitted Uses

The new Samaritan Athletic Medicine Center is an example of private development on OSU campus that potentially avoids non-OSU zone development requirements because it is deemed allowable development covered in this section. New policy 13.2.7 addresses this.

3.36.40 – Procedures and Determination of Compliance

The criteria that trigger a major adjustment include 3.36.40.04.a, exceeding a single dimensional standard by more than 10%, or 3.36.40.04.b, exceeding more than three dimensional standards by less than 10% each. It's not clear to me what policies these are implementing or how these specific criteria were devised.

LDC 3.36.40.04.f. allows open space mitigation, which is not allowed elsewhere in the City. A CP policy should establish minimum open space ratios for all zone types and exclude the possibility of mitigation.

3.36.60 – Development Standards

3.36.60.08.e refers to an operational shuttle without describing its attributes that would ensure that it actually solves a parking problem.

3.36.90 – Monitoring

1. Monitoring reports should be directed to the City Council and Planning Commission rather than simply the City, since these are the decision making bodies that adopted the Plan and are best able to judge compliance with the intention of the adopted plan.
2. There is no mention of monitoring OSU population (students, faculty, and staff). Population drives the need for buildings, traffic capacity, and parking. Add policy requiring monitoring of OSU population.
3. The existing CP policy 11.12.2, *The University shall develop and implement a transportation and parking plan that reduces the negative traffic and parking impacts on existing residential areas* should cover recent parking complaints, but public testimony indicates it is not happening. The area defined by the University Neighborhood Overlay (LDC 3.34) could be included in the monitoring of university-related parking impacts. This is a new section since 3.36 was written. A policy defining existing residential areas in terms of 3.34 should be added.
4. Basing the need for new parking on exceeding 90% utilization, while allowing the University to control the price and supply of permits creates a moral hazard. A policy that establishes **minimum** utilization, or establishes a new, independent way by which permit supply and prices are set could address the issue.
5. For ease of comparison and to understand the worst case, traffic and parking studies should be performed at the same peak time annually.